

Serial No. 10/669,604
Amendment Dated: April 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings contains changes to Fig. 5. This sheet replaces the original sheet containing Fig. 5.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Serial No. 10/669,604
Amendment Dated: April 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2005

Amendments to the Abstract:

Please substitute the new Abstract of the Disclosure submitted herewith on a separate unnumbered page for the original Abstract presently in the application.

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 6-9 and 15-17 have been withdrawn, claims 2-5 and 11-14 have been cancelled, and claims 1 and 10 have been amended.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement of Applicants' claim for foreign priority, and that all of the certified copies of the priority document have been received. Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the documents cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 11, 2004.

Figure 11 is objected to because it does not contain reference signs 99a-d, which are mentioned in the description of the figure in the Specification. Accordingly, the description of the figure in the Specification has been modified so that there is an agreement with figure 11. Specifically, all references in the Specification to 99a, 99b, 99c and 99d have been changed to 99e, 99f, 99g and 99h respectively.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Figure 5 is objected to because the reference 41a does not appear in the description of the figure in the Specification. Accordingly, reference 41a in Figure 5 has been changed to 40b, so that the figure agrees with the description.

The Office Action states that the Abstract of the Disclosure is objected to because it is too long. Accordingly, the Abstract has been revised so that it is

less than 150 words as required by M.P.E.P. § 608.01(b). It is respectfully requested that objection to the Abstract be withdrawn

The Specification is objected to for various informalities, specifically errors in the translation into English. Accordingly, Applicant has corrected the two specific errors noted in the Office Action on pages 2 and 7 of the specification, and has also reviewed the entire specification and corrected numerous other grammatical errors. No new matter has been added to the specification.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,902,033 to Levis et al. (“Levis”). The ground of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Levis does not anticipate claims 1 and 10, as amended, because Levis does not disclose all of the elements of these claims. The Office Action correctly acknowledges that “Levis does not teach what form the mounting for Levis’ novel light tunnel takes.” As such, Levis does not meet the limitation of “a mounting portion provided for mounting the light tunnel to the image projection engine body, the mounting portion being configured integral with the thin metal sheet of the tubular portion” of the light tunnel.

Moreover, amended claims 1 and 3 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,773,118 to Lee (“Lee”).

As amended, the light tunnel according to claims 1 and 10 provide a specific mounting portion having positioning apertures or projections for engagement with positioning projections or recesses provided at the image projection engine body or chassis. This advantageously allows the light tunnel 30 to be mounted on the chassis 60 without use of any extra fittings, as described in page 10, lines 19-23 of the specification, thus enabling accurate positioning.

The combination of Lee and Levis does not render Applicant's claims 1 and 10 unpatentable because the combination does not disclose or suggest all the elements of Applicant's claims 1 and 10. For example, the combination of Lee and Levis does not disclose a light tunnel that "has a mounting portion provided for mounting the light tunnel to the image projection engine body, the mounting portion being configured integral with the thin metal sheet of the tubular portion" of the light tunnel. Nor would the combination provide a mounting portion of the light tunnel having "positioning apertures or projections for engagement with the corresponding positioning projections or recesses of the image projection engine body," as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 10.

In contrast to the current invention in which the mounting brackets are integral to the light tunnel, Lee discloses a method of mounting a light tunnel that requires more components and more steps to manufacture. Figure 3a of Lee discloses a light tunnel that is constructed of four pieces of glass and requires separate mounting brackets 26 and 27. These brackets must be glued to the light tunnel. (Col. 4, lines 40-46). In addition, figure 2b illustrates that clip

device 21 is required to secure the light tunnel and brackets to the optical engine 22.

Levis does not disclose a light tunnel providing positioning apertures or projections for engagement with positioning projections. Indeed, the Office Action acknowledges that "Levis does not teach what form the mounting for Levis' novel light tunnel takes."

Because Lee and Levis each do not disclose or suggest a light tunnel that "has a mounting portion provided for mounting the light tunnel to the image projection engine body, the mounting portion being configured integral with the thin metal sheet of the tubular portion" or a mounting portion having "positioning apertures or projections for engagement with the corresponding positioning projections or recesses of the image projection engine body," as recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 10, even combined, the references do not render claims 1 and 10 unpatentable.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 10 be withdrawn.

All outstanding objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition of allowance.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Serial No. 10/669,604
Amendment Dated: April 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2005

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010482.52788US).

Respectfully submitted,

April 14, 2005



Jeffrey D. Sanek
Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:AJH

370266 v1